DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 173 380 TM 008 992

AUTHOR Morris, Lorenzo
TITLE The Role of Testing in Institutional Selectivity and Black Access to Higher Education.
PUB DATE [Apr 79]
NOTE 37p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (63rd, San Francisco, California, April 8-12, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Access to Education; Achievement Tests; Admission Criteria; *Black Students; College Admission; *College Entrance Examinations; *Competitive Selection; *Educational Discrimination; Educational Policy; *Enrollment Trends; Higher Education; Low Income Groups; Racial Differences; Senior High Schools; Socioeconomic Influences; *Test Bias; Test Validity

ABSTRACT

Student distribution among institutions of higher education corresponds more to the socioeconomic status of institutions than to the test-predicted performance levels. Aggregate data shows that the more costly institutions recruit wealthier students with higher test scores. Traditionally black institutions rely far less on test results, preferring to depend overwhelmingly on grades. Non-black institutions tend to judge and counsel black students, as much or more than other students, on the basis of test results. The setting of admission standards in higher education is treated as the private right of institutions, and the exercise of that right essentially corresponds to the characteristics, particularly the socioeconomic status, of the institutions. (Author/BH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED173380

The Role of Testing in Institutional Selectivity and Black Access to Higher Education

Presented at

The Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association

Lorenzo Morris
Senior Fellow
Institute for the Study
of Educational Policy
Howard University
Washington, D. C. 20008

TM008 992

Session: 27.16

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Dr Lorenzo Morris

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Achievement tests have been widely criticized for their cultural biases and psychometric deficiencies on the grounds that they are much less value free and much less objective than their staunchest advocates claim. An essential element in the tests, and therefore a major concern of the critics, is the use of quantitative methods to evaluate a melange of seemingly unquantifiable personal and intellectual characteristics. Ironically, critics of standardized achievement tests are often led into the treacherous domain they want to attack. They first use sociological techniques to quantitatively demonstrate the evaluation deficiencies of the tests in use, presumably their inherent insensitivity to real-world knowledge and learning potential. Second, they often use psychometric techniques to demonstrate both the need and capacity for improving existing achievement test measures. Yet, at both levels of criticism, the essential social purpose of testing is largely overlooked inasmuch as the decisions to use them and expectations about consequent outcomes of testing go practically unscathed by criticism of inefficiency in the instruments. When the tests are shown to be weak, the decision-making processes continue to be shielded by a coat of rational evaluation and planning, while it appears that only the tools need sharpening.

A persistent implication of such criticism is that standardized testing is essential to the fulfillment of of egalitarian and educational ideals held by the institutions which use them. The concommitant effect is thus to get test-makers to try harder in the hope that cultural and related test-biases would disappear. Perhaps, they could disappear or be substantially minimized but that is not the only important question. For the present, it is more important to know where the responsibility for the ill-effects lies and how more value-free procedures can be effected. In other words, we can not, as educators and administrators, plan a psychometric "breakthrough" in testing, but we may restructure education policy at the societal or institutional levels so that better use may be made of existing and future tests.

The Rationalization of Educational Authority

In terms of education policy, the significance of evaluating anyone's intellectual potential (a function of innate ability and past learning), as achievement

tests appear to do, must be grounded in a policy-decision to distribute public or private institutional resources on the basis of the variable potentials presumably identified.[1] The policy effect then of instituting achievement tests is to say generally that some students, on the basis of their inherent intellectual promise, deserve more or different educational resources from other students. At the level of public policy and social values, this position is premised first on the belief that deference to biologically-determined or socially predetermined individual differences is consistent with egalitarian society and, therefore, a socially acceptable basis for the unequal distribution of public educational resources. Secondly, it is taken for granted that leaving "natural or pre-developed aptitudes" to make their own way in the world of higher education is thoroughly unacceptable because socioeconomic inequalities intervene in other admissions criteria to create still more inegalitarian barriers to educational advancement for some students and unfair advantages for others. At the institutional level, it is assumed that the investment of institutional resources in students is rewarded in relation to the test-certified degree of student preparedness. Ultimately, one comes to the essential premise in education policy that achievement testing is a more rational and,

thereby, more egalitarian basis for the allocation of educational opportunity than would be any selection procedure that did not evaluate individual intellectual attainment and potential hierarchically. A corollary here is that the absence of such testing, with its student ranking component, would leave everyone vulnerable to less fair, less rational and more value-biased social-order rankings for the determination of admissions.

A crucial omission in criticisms of testing is the rebuttal of this last point; namely, the assumption that testing is a critical part of a rational system of selection.

For a policy-oriented critique, the question is not "how good or how useful the tests may be," but rather "how are they used and who determines how or for what they are good." In order to change a policy, one is most likely to succeed by arguing that it is a bad policy and not simply that the policy has failed to reach its objectives. Recognition of failure can simply lead to "trying harder" which, in this case, would mean trying to improve the tools of the policy, i.e., the particular tests. The policy itself, however, only comes under direct attack when its purposes or intentions are judged to be either ill-conceived or undesirable. For standardized testing that would mean most generally that tests

are, and were intended to perpetuate social inequalities of educational opportunity or that testing permits a free rein to other sources of social inequality. The significant political question does not center on the degree to which the tests may be adequate but rather on the purpose and nature of adequacy, itself. In this regard, the answer may be that tests are modes of objectifying existing social differences, and that they have a subjective and probably unconscious purpose of rationalizing or excusing social and racial inequities.

Ideally, the locus of decision-making authority in public higher education should reside in the public sector with a governing body and perhaps, to a lesser extent, with top administrative officials. Educational administrators should then only determine, within a restricted range, the implementation of public authority. Similarly, in publicly financed private higher education, authority to pass on the adequacy and equity of the private use of public funds should be explicitly lodged with publicly responsible educational officials who interpretate broader policy. In other areas of the public policy, defense, housing and welfare, to name a few, it is widely recognized that the ideal situation no longer applies, if it ever did, and that fundamental authority has been subsumed under administrative structures and under private, but publicly-subsidized, institutions. It is no less true in public education. The idealized separation of

policy and administration is one of the most tenacious, and least accurate of American myths. The myth, however, is understandable from a cultural-historical perspective -- a perspective which reveals a trend in American political history to push "politics" out of government and, even more so, out of educational administration. Of course, the separation is impossible but the goal of pursuing that separation has been, and still is, idolized. The pursuit of this goal has as a consequence the propagation of the myth that the impossible has been, or is being, achieved. The institutionalization of standardized testing is a child of this same complex of orientation and myth.

Consequently, where differences of race and social class turn into contested political issues everywhere else, they are ultimately only resolved through the interaction or recommendation of politically powerful interests, but rarely does this happen in higher education. The clear exceptions are those political actions contesting the constitutionality of institutional structures. For example, court-ordered regulations and guidelines from the U.S. Office for Civil Rights mandate "desegregation" of selected southern colleges and universities in conformity with the 1954 Supreme Court decision in Brown v. Board. . . . However, the internal

processes, particularly admissions, remain effectively free from external review. Short of blatant discrimination, equity is taken for granted. The Bakke case, which appeared to bring admissions under public survellance, did so only to the extent that a common regularized practice had been replaced by a new one containing affirmative-action goals. At most, the Supreme Court, always more intrepid in education than its federal colleagues, called for a return to standard pre-established practice in the Bakke decision. It did not investigate the equity of earlier practices, but left it up to the California Regents to confess to or deny past injustices.[3] The Court took as one of its points of departure the presumed equity and objectivity of the standardized test scores on which common admissions practices rely to a significant extent.

Extent of Reliance on Standardized Achievement Tests in Undergraduate Admissions

The vast majority of colleges and universities require that student applicants take these tests but only a minority admit to caring a whole lot about the results. Preliminary findings from a survey done at the Institute for the Study of Educational Policy (ISEP) show 82.3 percent

require their freshmen applicants to take either the SAT or the ACT. Those schools which do not require standardized tests substitute special admissions tests. By contrast, the survey shows that 40 percent of the institutions have no set secondary school course requirements for their freshmen applicants. Yet, the expressed stringency of these two sets of requirements, where they exists, is rather inverted. Whether as requirement or preference, most institutions have precise guidelines governing the eligibity of applicants in terms of their secondary school courses. Virtually none of the schools surveyed would admit to having test-score minimums although virtually all institutions consider them in the admissions process.

When asked specifically, "what are the minimum exam scores normally required of freshmen applicants," there were not enough answers to be judged significant. This could be because the affirmative action officers surveyed were uninformed. However, if it were simply a matter of their lack of information, it would be inconsistent with other responses. In particular, all of the affirmative-action officers claimed to know how the test scores of minority applicants were treated in relationship to other students. For example, they were asked if the minimum score requirements were different for minorities and non-minorities. This question got one of the largest response rates.

What these two sets of responses suggests is not that test scores are treated with little interests by admissions officers, but rather that institutions have not established an explicit policy about how they should be treated. Effectively, they may be used in an arbitrary and subjective fashion by those in charge of admissions.

On the other hand, responses to other questions indicate that some overall policy perspective or rule of thumb guides the institutional use of those tests. Unfortunately, it has an air of obscurantism. Eighty-seven and one-half percent of the respondents said "there are no precise differences in the test requirements for minorities and non-minorities. Yet, 40 percent indicated that they made special use of these tests scores in subsequent counseling of minorities, and 67 percent said scores were generally used in subsequent student counseling. While the response rate is too small to be statistically significant, it is noteworthy that 21.4 percent rely "more heavily" on test scores for counseling minority as opposed to non-minority students.

To the extent that these preliminary findings are representative of the universe of institutional behavior, the achievement test scores have a long range impact on student life. While the use of test results may be imprecise, that very imprecision can easily add to their global effect on student admissions because there

are no clear boundaries to their use. Moreover, the assurance of equity in the admissions process may be less tenable when a presumably objectivity instrument is applied in an irregular if not subjective fashion.

In a widely cited article, "Admissions and the Relevance of Race," William Bowen succinctly depicts the ambiguities through which the typical admissions process at selective colleges wanders. He points out that at his institution (Princeton) three factors are crucial in student selection: "(1) the basic qualifications of individuals; (2) the composition of the student body; and (3) the potential contributions to society of those applicants . . . ."[4] Of the evaluation of individual qualifications he comments:

> Decisions regarding basic qualifications at the undergraduate level are made on the basis of such evidence as previous academic preparation, including both courses taken and grades earned; recommendations of teachers and others concerning personal qualities as well as academic achievement and promise; aptitude and achievement test scores; the experiences of other students at the university who had similar qualifications; and so on. Reading an applicant's folder to determine even basic qualifications is, of course, by no means a purely mechanical process. As is well known, there is no perfectly reliable or perfectly objective measure of any part of a candidate's credentials, and even such seemingly precise data as grades and test scores have to be examined carefully to determine what actual quality of achievement they reflect and what predictive power they may be thought to have in each instance.[5]

Institutional Variations in the Use of Standardized Achievement Tests

Of course, every institution is not like William Bowen's, and admissions practices, directed by the same natives, have to be differently designed to achieve the same ends. Reliance on achievement test scores can not therefore be meaningfully estimated without taking account of such institutional differences. Public colleges, particularly state and two-year colleges, have different constitutional obligations from private colleges and universities. The list of special institutional interests which would elicit correspondingly special admissions practices is too long to repeat here, but general variations may be effectively treated in terms of institutional selectivity. Unfortunately, it has not been possible to get data on test scores directly stratified by selectivity. However, the following distribution of institutions by type and control can serve to replicate some of the variations of selectivity and the use of tests.

Insert Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations of the Scholastic Attitude Test (SAT), Scholastic Attitude Test-Mathematic (SAT-M), and American College Test (ACT) by Type and Control of Institution: 1974 - 1975

The average achievement tests scores vary considerably among types of institutions. The variance is generally

related to their degree of selectivity. That is, universities and four-year colleges have higher average SAT scores than two-year colleges. Private institutions have higher scores than public ones, of the same type, with the exception of two-year colleges. The range of scores of institutions in each type is, however, greater than the difference in the average of each type. The standard deviation (SD), shown in Table 1 above, indicates that, in terms of test scores, the average student in the least selective type of college would be within the normal range of students in the most selective type of institution. In other words, the low end of the normal range (SD) at private four-year colleges is 656 (912 $\bar{x}$SAT - 256 SD = 656) which is 24 to 76 points below the average level of two-year institutions. Assuming a normal distribution of scores, more than a third of the selective type of institutions have average scores below the average score of the least selective type. Yet, it is on the basis of such relatively small differences that students are frequently denied access to the college of their choice.[6]

Referring to variations in accessibility of higher education institutions, Alexander Astin argues that hierarchical relationships among institutions have been consciously developed. By addressing his critique to public systems of higher education, he effectively excludes the justification of private right of choice used to sustain

an uncritical acceptance of selective admission in "elite" private institutions. Thus, the institutional diversity associated with varying admissions practices becomes a public policy concern because public institutions have distinct social responsibilities. Accordingly, Astin comments:

> . . . legislators and policy makers should be encouraged to take a more critical look at what has been somewhat euphemistically called "diversity," and to examine the consequences of current admissions policies in terms of such diversity.
>
> To put institutional diversity in a somewhat different light, it is possible to argue that higher education in the United States has evolved into a highly refined institutional status hierarchy. Like most status systems, it comprises a few elite and widely known institutions, a substantial middle class, and a large number of relatively unknown institutions. While most people are familiar with the hierarchical nature of private higher education -- with a few prestigious private universities occupying the top positions -- it is not always recognized that a similar hierarchy exists within many public systems. Unlike the private hierarchy, which evolved more or less by historical accident, the hierarchies within the public system were developed as part of a conscious plan.[7]

If such a hierarchy has indeed consciously developed, then what role might testing serve? Ideally, testing is an innocent by-stander in the process of social-educational stratification. If so, its use as an instrument of selectivity should reflect the academic, or socio-economically independent status of the institutions. To further explore this concern, we need to first consider the extent to which

the selectivity of institutions corresponds to non-academic inequalities.

A good indication of non-academic sources of bias in the institutional use of standardized achievement tests can be drawn from Table 2 below. The average institutional SAT and ACT scores correspond directly to the cost of attending the institution.

Insert Table 2

Mean SAT-Verbal, SAT-Math, and ACT-Composite Scores by Cost of Attendance at Institutions of Higher Education

---

Considering that this distribution of costs includes public institutions, where tuition is relatively small, the relationship is significant. In addition, the break in the relationship for the most expensive category of institution can probably be explained in part by the inclusion of elite public institutions in the second and third categories.

A reasonable prima-facie case for showing non-academic differentiation in selectivity, in terms of institutional type, and socio-economic inequalities among students is indicated in Appendix Table A-1 below. Consistently, the family income levels of students in universities are higher than those of four-year college students, and those of two-year college students, the lowest. The latter students have family incomes that are only about 70 percent of those of

those of university students.

The diversity in student composition of institutional type when viewed as hierarchical structures reflects both a racial and economic bias. Particularly for Blacks, but also for Hispanics, one finds decreasing representation in the enrollment of minorities as one moves up the line from two-year institutions to universities. As Table 3 shows, there are about two and a half times as many black students enrolled in public two-year colleges as there are in public universities.

Insert Table 3

Full-time Enrollment in Institutions of Higher Education by Racial/Ethnic Group, and by Type and Control of Institution

---

Moreover, when black enrollment in traditionally and (new) predominantly black institutions is subtracted from total enrollment in higher education, the uneven racial distribution in traditionally white institution looks still more inequitable. About 30 percent of black students are enrolled in black institutions but over 41 percent of blacks in four-year colleges are found in black institutions. The comparable figures for two-year colleges and universities are lower (see Appendix, Table A-2), which could suggests that at both levels white institutions are relatively more open to blacks. However, the smallness of black enrollment

in universities, about 5 percent, makes such a conclusion unrealistic. In addition, the fact that about 23 percent of blacks in two-year colleges are in predominantly black situations, indicates that the apparent openness of enrollment may hide other racial inequities.

In this case, it is fair to assume that the free choice of students to attend a black institution, rather than being compelled to go there or nowhere, is best measured by looking at the traditionally black institutions. This does not mean that enrollment in predominantly black institutions represents "no-choice" outcomes for black students, but rather that the choice factor can not be readily estimated. It is, therefore, striking that all university enrollment, and 36 percent out of 41 percent of four-year college enrollment, in black institutions is found in the traditionally black ones.

Some of the racially uneven distribution of students among types of institutions can be explained by economic factors, costs and income. Black students are more heavily enrolled in public two-year colleges in part because the costs of these institutions are much lower than average. Still, the cost factor would not explain the relatively high black enrollment in four-year traditionally black public institutions where costs are fairly constant within each state. Moreover, Table 4 below demonstrates that even where black and white student family incomes are comparable, black students tend to be enrolled in low costs institutions.

Insert Table 4

Enrollment by Race and Institutional Cost of Attendance for Full-time Students, 1976

To a significant extent, the racial and economic maldistribution of students among types of institutions is a function of factors other than selectivity in admissions. Within the selective admissions process, factors other than tests scores clearly play a determinant role. Unfortunately, all these factors can not be weighted to determine their precise impact in a study of this size. Even so, the available data on admissions is much too scanty to procdue anything more than tenuous estimates.

However, by looking at admissions practices in terms of traditionally black and non-black institutions, differences in admissions practices with racial consequences can be identified. Moreover, some data on black institutions permits a much closer examination of institutional differences in the use of testing than is feasible on a more aggregate level.

Institutional Preferences and the Use of Testing, Black and White Differences

The overwhelming evidence of studies on student performance on achievement tests and college admissions indicates

that they constitute a major barrier to black student access. First, the evidence is clear that black students as a group consistently score lower than white students on these tests.[8] Second, the lower scores of black students serve to underestimate their ability to do college work.[9] A good illustration of this last point emerges from a study on disadvantaged minority student performance on the SAT's and then in college. The study observes:

> While it is true that minority students obtain lower test scores than their white colleagues at the same institution, there is strong evidence that those scores do not mean minority students are "unqualified" or even "less qualified" for admission to and scholastic success at these colleges. Although there is approximately 200-point gap between the scores of the minority students studied and the students at sample colleges, their major fields and graduation rates are comparable. And within the group of minority students, the graduation rates do not vary from those with the lowest scores to those with the highest.[10]

If these minority students had not been admitted through a special program, called "A Better Chance," they would almost certainly have been excluded from the selective institutions in which they eventually performed well. Moreover, the 200-point difference in SAT scores in this example is almost as large as the total range of variation among all types of colleges and universities, as noted in Table 1.

Of course, there are data available to support reliance on SATs, but the concern here is not to measure their

accuracy. Rather, it should be clear that standardized tests have at the very minimum, imperfect merit as a predictor of black performance. With that in mind, one can better understand the difference between white and black institutional uses of these test scores in their admissions processes.

A study by the American College Testing Program concludes that "by and large, tests are more a part of the admission requirement for traditionally black colleges than for all colleges." [11] However, this conclusion can be misleading in that it is based on the finding that 99 percent of black colleges versus 83 percent of all colleges require some test score, SAT, ACT or in a few cases CEEB Achievement Tests. It is nevertheless important to keep in mind that black institutions are at least as likely as any other to be informed of student test records.

Yet, the kinds of standards for test scores that these institutions set for their students are obviously different. The mean test scores of students at tradtionally black institutions are substantially lower than those of students at all institutions.

Tests	Race of Institution[12]		
	Black	All	Difference
ACT Composite	12	20	8
SAT Verbal	336	474	138
SAT Math	349	502	153

The large differences in test scores between students at black institutions and other students often fits into the thesis that black schools are less selective and accept less capable students. Unfortunately, there is no data suitable for comparing black and white institutional selectivity that would not also foreclose on any understanding of race-related institutional differences. In other words, secondary school grades, recommendations, and standardized testing only permit objective comparison across institution when one assumes that neither the students nor the institutions have special race-related educational characteristics. While allowing for that possibility, one can look at internal measures of selectivity in the distribution of students by high school rank. The American College Testing data show that traditionally black institutions vary from one to the other in terms of selectivity in much the same way as institutions generally. However, black colleges tend to be less selective in their use of GPA's (high school grade point averages). As shown below, only 10 percent of traditionally black schools typically draw their students from the top 10 percent of high school graduating classes as compared to 23 percent of all institutions:

Black	GPA's by Race of Institution[13]	All
5%	Highly selective (Top 10%)	5%
5%	Selective (Top 25%)	18%
16%	Traditional (Top 50%)	19%
48%	Liberal (some from lower 50%)	43%
31%	Open (all high school grads)	15%

In a representative sample of twelve out of the 80 traditionally black colleges, for which 1977 data is available, the average high school rank of the entering freshman classes was correlated with freshman class average total SAT scores. No significant correlation was found (see Appendix Table A-3). The quartile listing below indicates the weakness of the relationship:

Quartiles	Percent of Freshman in top 20% of H.S. Class	Average SAT Scores
1st	39%	734
2nd	30%	702
3rd	16%	722
4th	10%	713

Finding no significant relationship between SAT and high school class rank, it is all the more significant that performance in college at black institutions is better predicted by high school grades than by tests scores. The difference between GPA and freshman year grades at traditionally black

institutions is significantly lower than the difference for all institution according to American College Testing data:

Black Institutions		All Institutions[14]
2.4	Average high school GPA	3.0
2.3	Average first year college GPA	2.6
-0.1	Difference	-0.4

The point here is not to demonstrate that achievement test scores do or do not predict college performance. That is a concern for psychometric measurement which has been removed from the present analysis. Rather, assuming that these tests have an imperfect predictive value for the black student academic performance, why and how much do institutions rely on them? The point of looking specifically at black institutions is first that they require these tests as much as other institutions but they obviously rely on the scores less. The result of this reliance can in addition to freshman grades, be judged by the retention and graduation rates of the two types of institutions.

With less than 20 percent of the college enrollment in the four years prior to 1976, traditionally black institutions "awarded 37 percent of all baccalaureate degrees received by blacks in that year. At the same time, blacks

received only 6.5 percent of all baccalaureate degrees."[15] Thus, the share of black institution graduates is significantly higher than their share of the total enrollment of black students. Consequently, the relatively lesser reliance of these institutions of test scores does seems to work to their advantage and to the advantage of black students.

On the other hand, it has been argued that higher black attrition in white institutions is a reflection on higher academic standards. However, the data clearly contradict such an assumption. Two-year colleges, which are largely open enrollment and public, have much higher attrition rates than four-year colleges, black or white. Data from the National Longitudinal Study show that in the two years following 1972 "about a third of the black students dropped-out of four-year institutions as compared to a majority of those in two-year institutions."[16] The attrition problem is especially severe for low income students but students in higher income categories, black and white, have much higher attrition rates in two-year institutions. It is, therefore, unlikely that the higher retention rates of traditionally black institutions can be explained in terms of academic standards. Similarly, related assumptions about higher institutional costs as a factor in attrition at non-black institutions does not hold up under the weight of present data on attrition.

Since two-year institutions have, for the most part, open admissions, they do not use tests nor high school graduation rankings. From this point one can not conclude that a testing requirement would raise their retention rates. Rather, some mode of selectivity might help, but test scores, judging from the lower spectrum of black institution students, could not distinguish between the potential graduates, failures and drop-outs.

Conclusion

Whether or not tests predict black students performance, student distribution among institutions of higher education corresponds more to the socioeconomic status of institutions than to the test-predicted performance levels. Unfortunately, data is not available to determine exactly how the admissions process works in terms of weight given test results, but it is clearly from survey responses that educators make very limited claims about their value. Nevertheless, aggregate data show that more costly institutions recruit more wealthier students with higher test scores. Family wealth and test performance may be assumed to go together among white students, among black students the relationship falls apart.

The claimed use of test results by traditionally black institutions, in conjunction with their institutional test averages, provides substantial evidence that they do not

place much stock in these scores. The selectivity of these institutions depends overwhelmingly on grades and not on test scores.

For non-black institutions, the weight of reliance on tests is less certain but there is an evident tendency to judge and counsel black students, as much or more than other students, on the basis of them. Assuming that the race of the institution is not the only parameter of this difference in admissions practice, the type and socio-economic status of the institution are major variables. What is most important about all three institutional variables is that selectivity and exclusion of low-income black students readily characterizes the selective, non-black institutions without regard to reliance on testing. The use of tests may thus be a support or formal prop for other non-intellectual modes of selectivity.

In response to the question raised initially about how the use of standardized achievement testing affects social and racial inequality in higher education, the answer is three-fold. First, heavy reliance on such testing places blacks at a disadvantage, but there is no clear standard for the appropriate level of test reliance and thus no clear level of disadvantage (thanks to affirmative action in admission). Second, the setting of admissions standards in higher education is treated as the private right of institutions and the exercise of that right essentially

corresponds to the systemic characteristic and status, particularly socioeconomic status of institutions. Third, the use of achievement tests in higher education accommodates the social and racial inequalities among institutions; it does not rectify those inequalities. Consequently, achievement testing has the effect on blacks of standardizing inequalities rather than creating standards for objectivity in admissions.

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations of the Scholastic Attitude Test (SAT), Scholastic Attitude Test - Mathematic (SAT-M), and American College Test (ACT) by Type and Control of Institution: 1974 - 1975

	SAT	$\bar{x}$ SAT - M	$\bar{x}$ ACT
Private University			
average:	850	435	19.0
sd:	438	223	9.9
Public University			
average:	835	445	18.6
sd:	330	174	7.5
Private 4 year			
average:	912	469	20.4
sd:	256	129	5.9
Public 4 year			
average:	849	451	18.6
sd:	203	106	5.0
Private 2 year			
average:	680	326	15.0
sd:	356	188	7.9
Public 2 year			
average:	732	383	16.2
sd:	305	164	6.8

note: sd = standard deviation

SOURCE: Lorenzo Morris, Elusive Equality: The Status of Black Americans in Higher Education (Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press, 1979, forthcoming). Based on unpublished data from the College Entrance Examination Board and the American Council on Education.

Table 2

Mean SAT-Verbal, SAT-Math, and ACT-Composite Scores by Cost of Attendance at Institutions of Higher Education, 1974

Institutional Costs	$\bar{x}$ SAT -V	$\bar{x}$ SAT - M	$\bar{x}$ ACT
Less than $2,200	402	209	8.9
2,201 - 3,300	728	379	16.2
3,301 - 4,400	817	419	18.3
4,400 and above	662	334	14.8

Variable Numbers: 76, 81, and 74.

Source: Reanalysis of data from the College of Entrance Examination Board.

Table 3

Full-time Enrollment in Institutions of Higher Education, by Racial/Ethnic Group, and Type and Control of Institution: Aggregate United States, Fall 1976

Level of institution	Total	White [1]	Black [1]	Hispanic	Asian or Pacific Islander	American Indian/ Alaskan Native	Non-resident alien
UNIVERSITY:							
Number	2,079,939	1,794,252	107,399	56,115	42,401	9,494	70,278
Percent	100.0	86.3	5.2	2.7	2.0	0.5	3.4
Private:							
Number	480,729	401,856	31,403	10,717	10,511	1,657	24,585
Percent	100.0	83.6	6.5	2.2	2.2	0.3	5.1
Public:							
Number	1,589,210	1,392,396	75,996	45,398	31,890	7,837	45,693
Percent	100.0	87.0	4.8	2.9	2.0	0.5	2.9
OTHER 4-YEAR:							
Number	3,015,236	2,447,698	330,324	113,188	43,202	15,302	65,522
Percent	100.0	81.2	11.0	3.8	1.4	0.5	2.2
Private:							
Number	1,139,262	944,427	107,116	41,584	11,444	3,446	31,245
Percent	100.0	82.9	9.4	3.7	1.0	0.3	2.7
Public:							
Number	1,875,974	1,503,271	223,208	71,604	31,758	11,856	34,277
Percent	100.0	80.1	11.9	3.8	1.7	0.6	1.8
2-YEAR							
Number	1,690,775	1,272,034	221,874	119,444	33,908	18,424	25,091
Percent	100.0	75.2	13.1	7.1	2.0	1.1	1.5
Private:							
Number	118,507	78,920	16,479	18,100	700	1,496	2,812
Percent	100.0	66.6	13.9	15.3	0.6	1.3	2.4
Public:							
Number	1,572,268	1,193,114	205,395	101,344	33,208	16,928	22,279
Percent	100.0	75.9	13.1	6.4	2.1	1.1	1.4

[1] Non-Hispanic

NOTE: These data do not include those institutions that did not provide information by ethnic and racial categories.

Source: NCES, The Condition of Education, 1978, Table 3.6, p. 118.

Table A-1

Family Incomes of Students in Higher Education by Institutional Type 1972-1976, in Percent
(Dollars in Thousands)

Institutional Type	Total %	<$4	$4-9.9	$10-14.9	$15-19.9	$20-24.9	>$25	Median Income Constant $ current/constan
1972								
Two-Year	100.0	11.6	30.2	31.5	12.6	6.3	7.9	11126/11126
Four-Year	100.0	7.0	22.5	29.4	15.7	9.5	14.9	13153/13153
University	100.0	3.4	17.6	29.5	17.0	12.2	20.3	14908/14908
1974								
Two-Year	100.0	9.1	22.8	31.5	14.3	10.3	12.2	13031/11056
Four-Year	100.0	6.8	18.8	26.4	15.6	11.9	20.4	14802/12559
University	100.0	3.6	14.0	26.2	17.0	14.0	25.2	16994/14419
1976								
Two-Year	100.0	8.3	18.5	26.3	17.3	12.4	17.1	14475/10635
Four-Year	100.0	5.9	14.8	14.8	22.3	17.1	13.7	16025/11777
University	100.0	3.2	9.8	18.9	17.2	15.6	35.3	20290/14911

Source: Reanalysis of unpublished data from The American Council on Education.

Table A-2

Percentage and Frequency Distributions of Blacks Enrolled in Colleges and Universities by Type of Institutions, Fall 1976*

Type of Institution	Total Black Enrollment (all institutions)		Percent Enrolled in...			Percent Black Students of All Higher Education Students
	Number	Percent	HBC'S	NPBC'S	Other Than HBC'S/NPBC's	
All Institutions	1,034,680	100.0	17.8	11.9	70.3	9.3
Public	832,866	100.0	14.8	13.5	71.7	9.6
Private	201,814	100.0	29.9	5.4	64.7	8.4
All Universities	150,217	100.0	8.1	-	91.9	5.4
Public	104,908	100.0	4.7	-	95.3	5.0
Private	45,309	100.0	16.0	-	84.0	6.5
All 4 Year	455,170	100.0	35.9	5.5	58.6	10.4
Public	318,499	100.0	35.4	6.5	58.1	11.2
Private	136,671	100.0	37.1	3.2	59.7	8.9
All 2 Year	429,293	100.0	0.2	22.9	76.9	11.0
Public	409,459	100.0	1.5	22.4	76.1	10.9
Private	19,834	100.0	11.7	32.3	56.0	13.2

* Slight difference between these total and those of Table 3 is not significant.

Source: Preliminary data on Fall 1976 enrollment from the DHEW, National Center for Educational Statistics. Reproduced in National Advisory Committee on Black Education and Black Colleges and Universities. "Higher Education Equity: The Crisis of Appearance Versus Reality," First Annual Report, 1977, Washington, D.C., 1978, p. 15. Reproduced in L. Morris, Elusive Equality.

Appendix Table A-3

Institutions	% of Freshmen in Top 20% of H. S.	Total
1	75	782
2	59	690
3	43	731
4	40	653
5	31	691
6	28	763
7	19	772
8	15	699
9	15	697
10	12	720
11	11	689
12	6	716

Correlation Coefficient = .22392

The "T" test of distribution shows this correlation to have little significance.

FOOTNOTES

[1]In contrast, Samuel Bowles points out that it could be more reasonable, in terms of public policy, to distribute resources in inverse proportion to the intellectual abilities of students. The principle behind such a policy would be concerned primarily with individual need. See Samuel Bowles, "Unequal Education and the Reproduction of the Social Division of Labor," in Schooling in a Corporate Society, edited by Martin Carnoy (New York: David McKay, 1976), p. 60.

[2]Adams v. Califano, 4307. Supp. 118 (D.C.D.C. 1977).

[3]Regents of the University of California v. Allan Bakke 98S.U. 2733 (1978).

[4]William Bowen, "Admissions and the Relevance of Race," Educational Record (Fall 1977), p. 336.

[5]Ibid., p. 337.

[6]This paragraph is excepted from Lorenzo Morris, The Elusive Equality: The Status of Black Americans in Higher Education (Forthcoming).

[7]Alexander Astin, "The Myth of Equal Access in Public Higher Education," (A paper from the Southern Education Foundation, July 1975).

[8]See for example, Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, Selective Admissions in Higher Education (Washington, D.C.: Jossey Bass, 1977). Willian C. Sedlacek, et. al, "Black and Other Minority Admissions to Large Universities: A Four Year National Survey of Policies and Outcomes." (Paper presented at the American College Personnel Association Convention, April 6, 1973) and Humphrey Doermann, Toward Equal Access (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1978), pp. 114-121, and R. L. Flaugher, Bias in Testing: A Review and Discussion, (Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1974).

[9]See for example, William Boyd, "SAT's and Minorities: The Dangers of Underprediction," Change (November 1977), p. 64. A.S. Farrer, W. E. Sedlacek, and J. C. Brooks, Jr. "Longitudinal Predictions of Black and White University Student Grades." (Paper presented at the National Conference on Measurement in Education, February 27, 1973); Dr. Sylvia T. Johnson, The "Measurement Mystique": Issues in Selection for Professional Schools and Employment (Forthcoming publication by the Institute for the Study of Educational Policy), and Kenneth B. Clark and Lawrence Plotkin, The

Negro Student at Integrated Colleges. (New York: National Scholarship Service and Fund for Negro Students).

[10]William Boyd, "SAT's and Minorities: The Dangers of Underprediction," Change (November 1977), p. 64.

[11]The American College Testing Propane, "Some Characteristics of the Historically Black Colleges," (DHEW National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education and Black Colleges and Universities, 1978).

[12]Ibid.

[13]Ibid.

[14]Ibid.

[15]Lorenzo Morris, Elusive Equality, Chapter 6.

[16]Lorenzo Morris, Elusive Equality. See Also Andrew Kolstad, Attrition From Colleges: The Class of 1972 Two and One-Half Years After High School Graduation (DHEW, 1977).